

## REMARKS

Claims 1-17 are pending in the present application. Claims 6 and 11 have been amended in response to the comments provided during the telephonic interview.

## INTERVIEW SUMMARY

A telephonic interview between Examiner Will and Dr. Guy was held on April 9, 2003. Applicant sincerely appreciates the opportunity to resolve the issues at hand.

The discussion involved, primarily, the function of a universal joint versus a ball and socket joint. The Examiner agreed that a universal joint translates rotation while a ball and socket joint does not. As such, the claims specifically reciting universal joints will be allowed in a next action. Claims 1-5 and 15 recite universal joints.

Claims reciting dual pivot joints were described by the Examiner to read on joints other than universal joints which may not translate rotation. Claims 6 and 11 have been amended to specifically recite that the dual pivoting joint (claim 6) or handle attachment element (claim 11) translate rotation of the handle to the base (claim 6) or rotating line cutting device (claim 11). This amendment brings independent claims 6 and 11 into condition for allowance. Claims 7-10 ultimately depend from claim 6 and are patentable for the same reasons as

claim 6. Claims 12-14, 16 and 17 ultimately depend from claim 11 and are patentable for the same reasons as claim 11.

Support for the amendment is provided in, at least, paragraph 25 of the specification as filed.

#### REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 1, 2 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meltzer in view of Dunn et al.

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meltzer and Dunn as applied to claim 1 and further in view of Savell.

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meltzer and Dunn as applied to claim 1 and further in view of Kalmar.

Claim 6-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dunn in view of Meltzer and Braun & Deck.

Claim 11-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meltzer in view of Dunn and Braun & Deck.

All claims now recite a joint which translates rotation of the handle to the mower. As discussed in the telephonic interview none of the prior art combine this feature with the other features of the claimed invention. All rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103 have been traversed by argument or rendered moot

by amendment. Removal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103 is proper and respectfully requested.

#### CONCLUSIONS

Claims 1-17 are pending in the present application. All claims are in condition for allowance and notice thereof is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Joseph T. Guy, Ph.D.  
Agent for Applicants  
Registration Number 35,172  
NEXSEN PRUET JACOBS & POLLARD, LLC  
P.O. Box 10648  
Greenville, SC 29603  
Telephone: 864-370-2211  
Facsimile: 864-282-1177

April 9, 2003